



**District 4 Joint Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) +
Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) Meeting
January 24, 2018, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting Summary**

PAC members in attendance:

Ryan Dodge, Chair, Solano Transportation Authority
Steven Grover, Vice Chair, Alameda County Resident
Patrick Golier, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Leah Greenblat, West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
Carol Levine, Alameda County Resident
David Simons, Santa Clara County Resident

PAC members who participated via teleconference:

Bjorn Gripenburg, Sonoma County resident
Lauren Ledbetter, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Marty Martinez, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

BAC members in attendance:

Adam Foster, Contra Costa County resident
Bruce “Ole” Ohlson, Bike East Bay
Cory Peterson, Solano Transportation Authority
Eric Anderson, City of Berkeley
Jean Severinghaus, Marin County resident
Patrick Band, Napa County Bicycle Coalition
Tim Oey, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition

BAC members who participated via teleconference:

Bert Hill, San Francisco Bicycle Coalition
Bjorn Gripenburg, Marin County Bicycle Coalition
Lauren Ledbetter, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Non-members in attendance:

Brenton Smith, Bay Area Toll Authority
Colin Dentel-Post, San Francisco County Transportation Authority
Dan Dawson, Marin County Public Works (via teleconference)
John Cicarelli, Bicycle Solutions
Nick Dante, City of San Jose Department of Transportation (via teleconference)
Peter Lee, Bay Area Toll Authority
Rafael Manzanarez, ARUP

Caltrans staff in attendance:

Sergio Ruiz, staff liaison to the PAC and BAC, Pedestrian and Bicycle Branch Chief

Ina Gerhard, Office Chief, Transit and Community Planning
Greg Currey, Pedestrian and Bicycle Branch
Dianne Yee, Pedestrian and Bicycle Branch
Elliot Goodrich, Pedestrian and Bicycle Branch

The following PAC members was not present:
Chris Marks, Alameda County Transportation Authority
Mariana Parreiras, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District

The following BAC members were not present:
Brad Beck, Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Diana Meehan, Napa Valley Transportation Authority
Matthew Bomberg, Alameda County Transportation Authority
Mike Sallaberry, Chair, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Robert Tidmore, San Francisco resident
Steve Beroldo, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District

Agenda Item #1: Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
Quorums were held for both the PAC and BAC.

Agenda Item #2: Public comment
Eric Anderson shared that the ribbon-cutting for two new protected bike lanes on Hearst Avenue and Bancroft Way in Berkeley will be on Friday, January 26, 2018 ([flyer](#)).

Agenda Item #3: Review and approval of September 27, 2017 PAC meeting summary
Approved.

Agenda Item #4: Review and approval of October 18, 2017 BAC meeting summary
Approved.

Agenda Item #5: Update on Bay Bridge West Span Path Study
Peter Lee, Bay Area Toll Authority, gave a presentation on the Bay Bridge West Span Path Study, with an update on refined alternatives, design features, and preferred alignment on the north side of the bridge with a touchdown on Essex Street. Funding for construction has not been identified.
Discussion and comments:

- Suggestion to include a suicide and/or wind barrier as part of this project, instead of adding it later at a greater cost. Extending a suicide barrier below a cantilevered path may not be structurally feasible.
- San Francisco groups (agencies, organizations) requested to have this presentation. It could be scheduled after a public meeting in March.
- Suggestion for a wider path near the landing where more pedestrians are expected, and then narrower where pedestrian demand might be lower.

Agenda Item #6: Updates:
Sergio gave updates on the following topics:

- Highway Design Manual (HDM)
 - As of November 20, 2017, the HDM Chapter 1000 has updated guidance on Class I bikeway separation from pedestrian walkways and highways, and consistency with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD).

- Discussion:
 - The separation requirements for Class I paths (ie. centerline) and clearance requirements need to be updated.
 - Need guidance on mode separation.
- California Traffic Control Devices Committee recommendations for traffic control guidance on Class IV bikeways (Proposed edits to CA MUTCD for Class IV Bikeway)
 - Recommendation for “Bikes Only” regulatory sign requires FHWA concurrence for consistency with national MUTCD.
 - Discussion:
 - Section 9C.102 (CA) Class IV Bikeways – guidance for accessible parking or loading zones is unclear for whom unobstructed passage shall be maintained.
- Federal Highway Administration termination of Interim Approval 11 for Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB)
 - The FHWA interim approval for RRFBs has been rescinded due to patent issues.
 - Scheduled/funded projects that include RRFBs will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.
 - Discussion and comments:
 - The patent requirement is unduly restrictive. Could Caltrans define an alternative device without violating patent? The defined elements should include the location of beacon, flashing rate, and that it be pedestrian-activated.
 - Caltrans HQ should define another type of beacon for use as a short-term fix.
 - The City of Berkeley is planning to substitute RRFBs with pedestrian warning signs with LEDs embedded around the edge, although they are inferior to RRFBs. The flash rate/type matters, and should be rapid flash, not stutter flash.
 - In Fairfax, there are both RRFBs and embedded LED warning signs.
 - The Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s BAC noted that one-third of jurisdictions wanted to install RRFBs.
 - There is existing research on FHWA’s website: “[Investigating Improvements to Pedestrian Crossings with an Emphasis on the Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacon](#)”.
 - **PAC and BAC made a motion requesting Caltrans to commit resources to develop an alternative device that provides similar features as RRFBs, evaluate its effectiveness and level of compliance compared to RRFBs, and provide recommendations based on this evaluation.**
 - PAC and BAC also request the Caltrans HQ attend the next PAC or BAC meeting to discuss steps being taken in finding an alternative to RRFBs.

Agenda Item #7: Discussion on findings and proposed edits to HDM on pedestrian and bicycle mode separation

Steven Grover, Mode Separation Subcommittee Chair, PAC member gave an update on the mode separation subcommittee’s findings and proposed edits and proposed edits to HDM on pedestrian and bicycle mode separation.

Discussion:

- Add flared fencing (dynamic envelope), which adds clear width. An example of this is the US 101/Ralston Avenue overcrossing in Belmont.
- Clarify the definitions of Class II and Class III bikeways.
- “Nonmotorized transportation” may be the incorrect term to use, with recent increasing usage of motorized devices such as one-wheel segways and motorized skateboards. “Active transportation” may be a better term to use.

- Look into the SFTMA study on bicycle-pedestrian conflicts on the Embarcadero promenade.
- Choose term “shared-use path” or “multi-use path”.
- The terms must be consistent with language already in the HDM.
- **A motion was made to conceptually support the three proposed solutions, with further edits per comments.** Nay: Patrick, Jean. Abstain: Bjorn
 1. Rename "Class I Bikeway" to “Class I Path” to make distinct from the three bikeways designed for the primary (Class II & III) or exclusive (Class IV) use by cyclists.
 2. Provide guidelines for two types of Class I Paths: 1) Path without Mode Separation (travel modes are mixed), and 2) Path with Mode Separation (travel modes are separated).
 3. Eliminate exception for shoulders for Class I Paths on structures, resulting in a total minimum clear width of 12 feet (8-foot path + two 2-foot shoulders), 2 feet more than the current minimum required width for Class I Bikeways on structures.
- Comments are due in two weeks to the subcommittee.

Agenda Item #8: Update on the District 4 Bicycle Plan

Sergio Ruiz gave a brief update on the status of the District 4 Bicycle Plan (Plan):

- District 4 received 1,600 comments on the Plan, which are being reviewed.
- The next Technical Advisory Meeting (TAC) is on Friday, February 2, 2018.

Agenda Item #9: Active Transportation Program Cycle 4 (2019) proposals by District 4, process and timeline

Sergio Ruiz introduced the District Active Transportation Program (ATP) Application Guidance.

- District 4 has submitted a few ATP project concepts to Caltrans HQ. HQ will provide feedback, after which D4 will prepare ATP applications, due later this year.
- Committee members were asked to contact Sergio for input on ATP projects to pursue.

Agenda Item #10: PAC 2018 Work Plan and topics for next PAC meeting: March 28, 2018, 10 a.m. - 12 p.m.

- Committee members should contact Sergio for comments on the Work Plan or topics to suggest for the next PAC meeting.

Agenda Item #11: BAC 2018 Work Plan and topics for next BAC meeting: April 18, 2018, 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

- Committee members should contact Sergio for comments on the Work Plan or topics to suggest for the next BAC meeting.

Agenda Item #12: Announcements and information sharing

- David – The [Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan Update Draft](#) is now available online. Comments are due Monday, March 19, 2018.
- Leah – At the next PAC meeting, the PAC could review membership applications.
- Jean – The Richmond-San Rafael Bridge path pilot project is at risk of being removed. Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) needs more information on the usefulness of the bike/ped lane on the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.
- Ole – Class II bike lane guidance is not effective as it is currently detailed in the Class II bike lane section in the HDM Chapter 1000.